



Historic Town of Hyde Park

Planning Board
4383 Albany Post Road
Hyde Park, NY 12538
(845) 229-5111, Ext. 2, (845) 229-0349 Fax

“Working with you for a better Hyde Park”

MINUTES OF THE JULY 21, 2021, 6:00 PM PUBLIC HEARING/WORKSHOP/REGULAR MEETING OF THE HYDE PARK PLANNING BOARD

MEMBERS PRESENT: MICHAEL DUPREE, CHAIRMAN
ANNE DEXTER - VICE CHAIR
DIANE DI NAPOLI
BRENT PICKETT
STEPHANIE WASSER
ANN WEISER

MEMBERS ABSENT: CHRISTOPHER OLIVER

OTHERS PRESENT: VICTORIA POLIDORO, PB CONSULTING ATTORNEY
PETER SETARO, CPL, PB CONSULTING ENGINEER
BONNIE FRANSON, NPV, PB CONSULTING PLANNER
KATHLEEN MOSS, ZONING ADMINISTRATOR
CYNTHIA WITMAN, PB SECRETARY

| TABLE OF CONTENTS | PAGE |
|---|--------------|
| CARRIAGE TRAILS (A.K.A. CROFTON MEWS) | 2-7 |
| CAMP VICTORY LAKE MASTER PLAN 7 PHASE 1 CHURCH | 8-16 |
| HYDE PARK TOWN CENTER-PARK PLAZA | 16-17 |
| PLANNING BOARD MINUTES APPROVAL | 17-18 |

Chairman Dupree: Good evening everyone. Thank you for joining the July 21st meeting of the Hyde Park Planning Board. Please take note of the exits around the room and now join me as we salute the *American Flag*.

The Chairman led the Pledge.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING:

CARRIAGE TRAILS (a.k.a. Crofton Mews)

Extension of Site Plan Deadlines for Construction (#16-96)

Location: 1269 Route 9G

Grid #: 6165-01-340743

In Attendance: Louis Kaufman, Elbow Creek LLC

Chairman Dupree: Thank you. Before we begin, on behalf of the Board, I'd like to wish our colleague Ms. Weiser a happy birthday tonight. *Clapping and salutations.* It's just nice that we have someone who, instead of celebrating her birthday, is joining us on the Planning Board dais tonight. The first item on the agenda is Carriage Trails, also known as Crofton Mews. The applicants are here for an extension of site plan deadlines to complete construction. May I get a motion to re-open the public hearing?

MOTION: Vice-Chair Dexter

SECOND: Ms. DiNapoli

To re-open the public hearing for Carriage Trails (a.k.a. Crofton Mews).

| | |
|---------------|--------------------------|
| Aye | Ms. Weiser |
| Aye | Ms. Wasser |
| Aye | Mr. Pickett |
| Absent | Mr. Oliver |
| Aye | Ms. DiNapoli |
| Aye | Vice-Chair Dexter |
| Aye | Chairman Dupree |

VOICE VOTE Aye-6 Absent-1 Nay- 0 Motion Carried

Mr. Kaufman: Lou Kaufman for the applicant. We have been trying to address some of the comments that we've received to our preliminary submission and certain threshold questions were arising about the vested zoning and the bridge and the street and all that. So we wanted some guidance from the Board and we had asked for a meeting, because it was hard for us even to get started with all of the revised plans. We have the layouts, but there's certain information that contained on the plans themselves. We had asked for a meeting and the Chairman is gracious enough to set something up. At this point it looks like for the people that will attend, the earliest is

next Friday, which is okay. We'll be ready and have our team there to go over some of the issues, which I can list, but let's not waste our time or the Board's tonight. However, based on my simple math, I'm thinking, okay next Friday and then the deadline for the August meeting is the Tuesday after that and we have not been that fast to begin with. So to assemble everything and have it printed in a day and a half is unrealistic. Whereas initially, we were talking about August 10th, that's not going to happen. We want to have something intelligent that you guys can go over and have somethings that you can consider. Then, I was thinking the September meeting, but the September meeting is only September 1, so there's not a whole lot of leeway there. Realistically, in order for me to have an intelligent and full application, that then can be torn apart, I think October is the realistic thing. If the Board would see its way clear to adjourn this until October, hopefully I'll have something intelligent to review.

Chairman Dupree: Would you like the first meeting in October or the second? The 6th or the 20th.

Mr. Kaufman: And when would you have to have it in for the 6th?

Mr. Setaro: 15 days or so ahead.

Mr. Kaufman: I would like to think we'd have our act together before then, so I would take that.

Chairman Dupree: Any other comments from the consultants or the Board? We are tentatively scheduling this for Friday of next week.

Mr. Kaufman: I'll have the planner and I'll have my attorney and the engineer. Truthfully, it's about the special questions that Brian Morgan had raised, so you and I and Victoria - and whomever else you feel will come, that'll be great.

Mr. Setaro: Is that going to be a legal meeting?

Mr. Kaufman: It's mostly legal issues, I think.

Chairman Dupree: The bridge is part of the discussion as well. Do you want to be a part of it? It seems wise or prudent.

Mr. Setaro: Virtual or in person?

Chairman Dupree: In person, but you could always phone in if you'd like.

Mr. Setaro: I'm not going to be around in the afternoon next Friday. Do we have a time?

Chairman Dupree: I think Stephanie is only free in the afternoon.

Mr. Setaro: Then I guess I can call in.

Ms. Franson: Do you need planning or just engineering and legal for now?

Mr. Kaufman: I think legal and planning are the issues we're going to address. Let me just give you an idea of what they are. Some of the issues that we'd like to get an idea about would be the bridge or the culvert improvements over Crum Elbow Creek. The design and environmental context. The project density and the vested rights, which Mr. Morgan raised in a memo that was sent to Victoria. I don't know if it's been shared or not. He brought up some points that I hope will convince the Board that we have valid points. If the Town is amenable to us rehabilitating the bridge, the next question is do you still want the road or do you want to have it as a private road with all the easements for the waterline and that stuff within it. I think the bridge is a critical issue. Then out of necessity, have to decide about the road. We seem to have bonding issues which you had mentioned. I don't know how we bond anything without knowing what it is we're bonding. It has always been discussed that it was at a building permit. That seems to have shifted, so I want to talk about that. I'm going to give you our application after we discuss it and either I'm going to get blown out of the water or you're going to consider it. I did want to get some threshold things done and then hopefully next week will give me some guidance.

Chairman Dupree: Just a reminder, that in terms of the offer of cession and the road being private or public, school buses will not go down private roads. I think that someone from your side said they change those procedures and policies all the time. They haven't changed them in 17 years. I'm just making sure you're aware if you want it to be a private road.

Mr. Kaufman: True. That's one of the problems. I'm amenable to Crofton Boulevard remaining, Crofton Boulevard. I'm not so sure Mr. Setaro or you all are that thrilled with that concept, because if it's a public road, he's been very clear, that they want a new span bridge. That's a big economic problem that has killed this project a few times. And we want to make it work, but we have to be realistic about what we can do. The cost of the bridge comparably with what they've been putting in over the last few years is above 2 million dollars now - similar bridges, span bridges. We can rehabilitate that, but I don't even want to get into the engineering. I will leave that to the engineers.

Chairman Dupree: Just to remind the Board, the reason why this is such a big nut to crack, is because the bridge would have to be built and be operational before he could pull a building permit. As Lou said, this has killed the project before because you're spending a lot of money that you get no return off of initially. Bonnie, you want to add something?

Ms. Franson: I just wanted to ask about the status of any discussion with the DEC? I'm newer to this project, but I thought a lot had to do with DEC's requirements as part of the SEQR process. So I was curious if they've expressed anything to you.

Mr. Kaufman: I've been told that the DEC is a primary decider in this case. However, one of the problems I'm having is how do I go to the DEC until the lead agency has at least said we would find this acceptable. Lead agency being the Planning Board. Someone has to make that move. So if the Planning Board is saying that if you can

get those permits, we'll be good with it, then that's an understanding. But if I had to go get those permits first, then I'm not even going to get through the door. They're going to ask what the lead agency says. I think we can convince DEC that what we're planning would not disrupt the place environmentally and will be of sufficient structural strength - that's me talking now - that's what I'm reading. Whether I can convince the people that make the decisions, that will be up to my bridge expert. So, I've gotten a report and they say it can be done. They're going to line things, structurally - you know the head walls will be reinforced, we'll put the waterline within the bed of that road which would create a waterline right of way. We would have to protect it from cold obviously, can it be done. All of the issues are there. The Board of Health has said, can you get it done, because you'll open up Hyde Park, that side to a great degree and you'll salvage failing, significant amount of homes there. They're willing to work with us and they'll bring people to the table, but I have to have you people say that we're going in the direction, that if we can get that done, you're okay. We have to find out.

Chairman Dupree: So for pretty much everybody, except for Anne and I, most of the people up here are new to this project as well. What Mr. Kaufman is referring to now is that there was an informal agreement, I guess I'll call it, between the Town and the prior project sponsors to bring the water line, that's been brought in already - so the water line that they have comes from the water line on Route 9, it goes up and then down Hudson Drive. They brought it east and the agreement was that they were going to bring it all the way to 9G. Dutchess Estates has a water quality and quantity problem at times for their district. You'd be bringing it up to the street that's all. The rest would have to be done by DCWWA or somebody else. That does help solve a problem for some of our residents as well, you're correct.

Mr. Kaufman: Lee Felshin said, I will help with this, because they very much want to solve that problem. That's a big problem for the community. Now they're talking, the community itself, maybe we'll dig another well. They want no part of that. They want DCWWA to be the operator and that why they're ensuring all of that investment from the tower all the way in that easement, which was a fortune, up Crofton Boulevard, which is in place, which we're going to test to make sure the line is still working. So there's a lot of investment already. It's still plenty of money to get it out there, but we can do that. The tough part of this will obviously be the permitting. It won't be the construction if it goes according to what we think we can do. We can cure that problem and obviously we want to because it's an incentive to the permitting divisions to go with us.

Chairman Dupree: So I think I'll try to invite Superintendent Fisher as well.

Mr. Setaro: If I could just comment. I know this is not what you want to hear, but I have talked to Howie and he is not in favor of taking over a road that's got those multiple culverts on it. Pretty much what he says, goes. I have to agree with him. It's just a maintenance headache to have those three culverts there. They clog up. The DEC, if there was something like this proposed today, they would never allow it because it is a clogging issue and they don't allow multiple culverts on their stream crossings anymore. I know it's an expensive number. Personally, I don't think it's the \$2,000,000.00 number but it is most definitely an expensive item. I'll be glad to

participate on a call next week, but I can tell you what the answer is going to be from our end of things. It's going to be no. I don't know how to say it any other way. I'm not trying to be rude or mean about it, it's a maintenance issue and if it's a Town road he wants the open span.

Mr. Kaufman: I think things changed where they're operating, at this point 250 units or close to it. We have maintenance staff. We run a pretty decent project, so it's a little different than something that's been vacant and a moonscape for years with just the Moose Lodge to expect some protection. I would suggest that we would probably do a better job of maintaining those culverts. It would be a private bridge. I don't know how else to say it.

Mr. Setaro: If it's private, it's private. That's a whole other story, but if it's proposed to become a Town road, which at this point and prior, it was. That's the reason the Town wanted the open-span, because we don't want to have to maintain 3 culverts and it's clogged a lot.

Mr. Kaufman: We have some hoops to jump through with DEC because they're of the mindset that an open-span bridge is better for the flow of water. Let's not kid ourselves. So the question is, will our bridge experts convince them that this bridge is acceptable with the revisions we're going to suggest, smooth on the bottoms and things like that. Will that work, if DEC will accept it? Because we're not coming up with any other answers right now. All of the comparable stuff that we're seeing - the last one put in was a similar size and was \$2.7 million. That doesn't add up for us, so I don't know how we're going to do it. It's a big problem. We got a decent price from the bank and now I know why. When we told you we were going to buy it, you guys looked at us like... really.

Chairman Dupree: I recall very clearly telling you that what caused the project to sputter was the bridge. And that it was DEC's requirement that it was open-span. I certainly understand what Pete's saying. Wasn't this where we had the beaver damming up issues as well. Everyone's nodding. Keeping the stream clear and running is not so easy in this area. Yes, Bonnie.

Ms. Franson: If Pete is saying that the Town will not accept a road unless it's open-span, then you need to pursue a private road based on the design you would like. Does it make sense, again, they really just need to go to DEC first.

Chairman Dupree: I would think so, I would think so.

Ms. Franson: I think they'll communicate with you in as much as the Planning Board may be lead agency because they're doing a lot of the permitting itself for that stream and they have the concerns with ecology, etc., but I think the Planning Board would want to hear from the DEC.

Chairman Dupree: Lou, who are you talking to over at the DEC, do you know?

Mr. Kaufman: There was a group of people. There was Sarah Pawliczak and a couple of others I can't remember. Sarah was the communicator.

Mr. Setaro: Was Rebecca Crist involved?

Mr. Kaufman: Maybe so.

Mr. Setaro: I don't remember back when, whether it was more of a DEC requirement to make it an open-span or the Town's requirement.

Mr. Kaufman: I'm not seeing about the DEC, but I trust your recollection.

Mr. Setaro: I tend to think it was more of a Town requirement, that if it was going to be a Town road then we wanted it to be an open-span. I don't think that the DEC required it, but.

Mr. Kaufman: I think the DEC was more worried about the turtles, frankly. I think we'll cure the turtles; the question is will we cure the road department problem. So we'll see. I know we'd be willing - first we have to ensure that the bridge is structurally appropriate. Let's say we do that. Now, is it environmentally acceptable. It's very easy to say, we'd prefer this than that, but right now it's nothing, so we'll see. I think I have someone who'll present a very sound engineering solution and I hope that I'm right about that. It's not something to be discussed tonight. I certainly will be giving you a bridge report and a solution to that with this application because that's a critical issue. I'll be giving you a set of drawings, but in order to do all that and give you a moderately full report, I have some homework to do. So I'm asking you for some more time.

There were no members of the public present for comment.

MOTION: Ms. DiNapoli

SECOND: Vice-Chair Dexter

To adjourn the public hearing for Carriage Trails (a.k.a. Crofton Mews) to October 20, 2021.

| | |
|---------------|--------------------------|
| Aye | Ms. Weiser |
| Aye | Ms. Wasser |
| Aye | Mr. Pickett |
| Absent | Mr. Oliver |
| Aye | Ms. DiNapoli |
| Aye | Vice-Chair Dexter |
| Aye | Chairman Dupree |

VOICE VOTE Aye-6 Absent-1 Nay- 0 Motion Carried

Chairman Dupree: Lou, we'll speak next Friday. And I'm going to speak to the DEC and see where their heads are in advance. Thank you.

WORKSHOP:

CAMP VICTORY LAKE MASTER PLAN & PHASE 1 CHURCH

Site Plan & Special Use Permit Approvals (#2018-66)

Location: 277 Crum Elbow Road

Grid#: 6265-04-630350

In Attendance:

Peter Sander, Rennia Engineering Design

Chairman Dupree: The next item on the agenda is a workshop. This is Camp Victory Lake's Master Plan and Phase 1, which is a large sanctuary/church. As a reminder, there's a lot of programming that occurs right now on the site. This is located on the north side of Crum Elbow and to the west of North Quaker. There are already a lot of activities that are conducted in tents and a variety of places. This will give them a central location in which to hold, so it's not as though it's an increase to the number of people who are there constantly. We're waiting for some updated traffic analysis. Otherwise, you've submitted what to me looked like very nice revised plans. So I'll turn it over to you.

Mr. Sander: Thank you for the introduction. Peter Sander from Rennia, here to provide another update for the Camp Victory Lake Religious Sanctuary. So we've been working with the architect and he decided to trim out his design. Reduced the footprint of the building, but expand the number of seats. That's because the seating arrangement prior to this submission was set-up more like a 'U' and now it's more linear. Similar to auditorium seating. Some of the highlights of the updated plan, a smaller building footprint, 56,000 down to 47,000, we've moved the building further east. So because of the reduced building footprint, it's actually given us more space in this area and increased the setback from North Quaker Lane. We've also added 3 lanes, rather than just 2. Now we have a drop-off lane, a travel lane and a bus queuing lane. I know that was a concern, where the buses were going to queue up, so we've addressed that. In addition we've also shown widening of the road, as requested to get us back to that bus parking toward the existing wastewater treatment plant. Also, we've made a ZBA submission. I've been assured that this footprint is the one we'll be sticking with, from the architects. So we decided that's a good place to begin working on that height variance. The Zoning Department also said that we need a stream corridor encroachment variance for Victory Lake and Fallkill Creek, which requires a 100-foot setback. Because of the tight space that we're working in, we're going to encroach on that setback. The closest portion on the site is this little corner right here which is around 26 feet away from Victory Lake. So really the discussion tonight is to get your thoughts on the new building layout. We want to move forward with a fully fleshed out design with landscaping plan, lighting plan and all of that stuff. We wanted to get your feedback on this first and then we can move ahead with that.

Chairman Dupree: And you're going to hear that tonight I promise. Ms. Franson? We just got your memo today and it's printed up for us too.

Ms. Franson: Many of my comments are more technical in nature that can be straightened out as part of the detailing of the site plan. I did want to mention,

especially with regard to parking, because you have more seats, you'll have to redo your parking calc. On the version of the plan that I saw, the overall parking calculation had dropped off, so it wasn't actually showing that you have the parking available. Just make sure that turns back on. Ultimately, as the Board goes through SEQR, you should discuss to what extent you need any visual analysis of the building and its current configuration and massing. As this progresses, I'm sure the Board will like to see more of the architectural detail in terms of materials, etc. Again, I just had minor comments. Now that things have been adjusted, it looks like there's a retaining wall to the south of the sanctuary, it's like in between the house and structure. I didn't see on the plans if it's served by septic and where the septic is relative to some of the grading that's going on and also depending on the retaining walls and the drop, whether any kind of fence would be prudent between the house and where the grading is happening by that parking lot for the sanctuary. Again, a lot of it's just details on the mechanical enclosure. The applicant has requested several waivers in terms of where the parking is relative to the building line, which you'll need to discuss at some point. There are still some remnant notes that appear and I don't know if they're going to come off or if there's something that's not shown, like a particular stormwater pond. I had a general question about whether in fact you do need to do any kind of grading by the cabins because of the slope that's there and because they're being relocated. I don't know how you would do that or if you don't need any kind of grading there. We had some comments on your EAF from a SEQR perspective and you made a new submission to update the SEQR form, which at some point will need to be done, but I know you're kind of going through this and still finessing the sanctuary layout. Those are the primary comments.

Chairman Dupree: Thank you and for everyone to recall, I believe we discussed the parking that's proposed to be closer North Quaker Lane and as I recall everyone seemed to be fine with it there. Now there would be a little bit of a discussion about the parking that's now to the south side of the sanctuary that's also in front of the building. As I recall, at least at our agenda meeting, everyone liked the idea of using church personnel or handicap in that area. You're probably going to hear that tonight. We're not really waiving the requirements. The language in the Code is relaxing the standards, because we're allowed to relax any of the standards if there is a practical reason to do so. In this case, if I recall correctly from my notes, everyone liked the idea that you're putting in landscaping and leaving some of the existing trees and shrubs along Quaker and adding more. That way it helps soften, that's why they more or less verbally agreed to relax the standard. Mr. Setaro?

Mr. Setaro: I didn't take too hard a look because it was mostly conceptual. There will have to be more engineering details and as Pete said they're going to make a full submission. Just a couple of things. Bonnie made a good point about the relocated cabins and any grading behind that because that would be part of your variance. You need a 100-foot setback from the lake. You're going to have to look at that and make that a part of your variance application, whatever area you're going to be grading within that 100 feet. Have you talked to the County Public Works Department yet about the access points, because you are keeping the existing single story frame house and you're proposing to keep the existing access right next to that driveway for I believe access to the mechanical equipment?

Mr. Sander: So we're going to ax that access now that we have the access lane.

Mr. Setaro: Okay, good get rid of it. I don't really have anything at this point. We'll wait until there's more detailed plans.

Ms. Moss: I had just contacted the applicant about the additional stream corridor variances that needed to be added to the application and they're taking care of that.

Chairman Dupree: Do you think this is something that the ZBA will refer to us for comment?

Ms. Polidoro: Eventually. The Zoning Board might look at it right now, but they're not going to be able to proceed until SEQR is done, so I expect that it will be an initial discussion and then they'll have to come back before this Board to go through the SEQR process.

Ms. Weiser: So I think the building's looking really great. It's become quite charming. I look forward to hearing the answers to Bonnie's questions, especially as it pertains to parking. How will traffic be managed for large events? She did ask if there'll be a parking lot attendant. How do we keep traffic from jamming?

Mr. Sander: The Camp Victory Lake staff will monitor and for most of the large events will direct people to which parking area they should be going and where they should be dropping off. That will all be outlined by the staff and discussed when the events occur.

Chairman Dupree: Thank you and I believe Ms. Franson, also suggested early on that they have some kind of event management plan for the larger events.

Mr. Setaro: I was just going to say that. Have you talked to the County yet about the project and the traffic report and submitted that?

Mr. Sander: Not too much. We wanted to rope down where everything is before diving deep into those kind of correspondences.

Mr. Setaro: You will submit the traffic report to them and they very well may talk about the event management plan. I've done a couple of them and anybody that's on the County Road that's directing traffic has got to be specific, possibly the Sheriff's Department for it. Again, that's all going to be a part of the details, but you will probably need somebody out there depending on the quantity of folks.

Mr. Pickett: I like what you've done and the changes. I like the idea of staggering the walls along Quaker Lane, so it's not one flat face now, it's three separate partitions. Just looking forward to seeing the finalized architectural details, planting and renderings.

Chairman Dupree: I think we forgot to mention that there's no huge, tall cross anymore proposed on top of the building.

Mr. Sander: That's right we did cut the apparent building height way down. The large cupola and the cross, which would have brought it up to over 100 feet have all been axed at the Camp's request too. They wanted a more modest design.

Ms. Wasser: Much improved design, thank you. I like the changes. I just want to confirm, it's my recollection you're defining a large event as how many people? What is your typical maximum? I want to say, you once said, 3,000 people or more?

Mr. Sander: Our max event was assessed at 5,000. That's typically how many. I've been toying around with developing different levels of events sizes, small, medium, large and extra-large. It would address how to manage those different numbers and that would go into the event management plan and be pretty well addressed.

Ms. Wasser: And certainly affecting all the parking layout and design, so I wish you good luck. I'd like to see an application.

Vice-Chair Dexter: I concur with all my colleagues' comments and I feel like we're getting closer to a much more practical plan. I have a question though, we wouldn't have calculated the height with the cross, correct?

Ms. Moss: No, we don't.

Chairman Dupree: It's not included in the building height but we would look at it in terms of visual impacts.

Vice-Chair Dexter: The actual cross does not get added to the height, but the cupola does.

Mr. Sander: So I think the cupola is actually exempt as well, correct?

Ms. Moss: Correct, unless it's usable space.

Mr. Sander: Given the size of the building, what actually pertains as a cupola, because it's going to be much bigger, it's not like just a shed cupola, it would be a large part of the structure.

Vice-Chair Dexter: I just wanted to make sure the recollection of our Code was still there, but yes, absolutely a much tighter plan. I really like the comments about thinking in terms of the flow, queueing and overall management. I do know you have large gatherings there on a regular basis and have been for years. I would just expect that that would continue and just become more robust. Thank you.

Ms. DiNapoli: I think you can go back and report that tonight's meeting went well. I concur with my colleagues. It is a tighter plan. It is much improved by making it smaller. I do have a question; my concern is parking on the grass. Take this year when it's been extremely rainy and you're parking - does that destroy the grass? What can be done to make sure that it gets restored? Is that even viable, to say write it in the resolution to say that it has to be restored at the end of the season?

Vice-Chair Dexter: Don't they make the grass pavers? We've looked at that for various things. So when you look at it, it looks like regular grass, but there's actual structure underneath there.

Chairman Dupree: But I don't think they're proposing that. Are you?

Mr. Sander: We're not actually proposing that currently. It's just a large expense for such an infrequent use of the grass parking areas.

Ms. DiNapoli: But aren't you also concerned about a rainy year like this? What are your thoughts?

Mr. Sander: Of course. All of my thoughts have to be in writing. *Laughter.* It's just so infrequent that the level of these large events. Really the primary parking areas will be able to handle the smaller events and I know your concern is for larger events. I don't have a great answer for that now, other than the infrequency of it. The Camp itself is going to want its campus looking nice and not rutted and torn up. Its own self-preservation of the existing facilities. They would try to return the grass to normal in the event that a large rain storm caused rutting or a loss of grass.

Mr. Setaro: We could put something on the plan to that effect.

Ms. DiNapoli: It was more - it dawned on me today, this being such a rainy season. I absolutely agree that the church itself would want it to be maintained, they always have, so I don't worry about it. It was more, has anyone thought of this?

Ms. Franson: For those of us that have been up to Bethel Woods for concerts, those tend to be weekly during the summer and all on grass. I don't think they have any pavers down, it's a combination of the soil that's there, the grass and how robust it is. If I recall correctly, they may have put hay or straw down after an event if it got muddy. Definitely, if it's something that's going to be relied on regularly, that parking area, then it should be part of the plan for maintenance.

Mr. Setaro: That's a good point Diane.

Chairman Dupree: I just want to weigh in, that turf is tough, that's why you don't have to water it during a drought. It will come back, for the most part. The concern is appropriate for you to raise because of what Peter just said - rutting. It's really wet and you start destroying the flatness of the land, then it's not going to come back, unless it's maintained. Just as a reminder also, all landscaping elements are supposed to be maintained. There's a note always on the plans about that, but we don't typically get into the grass. That was a good comment. This is overflow parking, if I'm correct, right?

Mr. Sander: Correct. We will then in our large event management plan, designate the least susceptible areas for the most overflow. We fix it so if this parking lot fills up, then the next parking lot will fill up, subsequently for the least likely to get affected by a large storm event.

Chairman Dupree: I believe what you basically heard tonight was nothing but nice things. I agree with all my colleagues, I think the building does look nice. It looks sort of like an Adirondack lodge to me, as opposed to just a sanctuary. When I first saw it, I was like, this doesn't signal church anymore, but it's a multi-use building, so it makes sense that it doesn't just convey church look all the time. Also, I have to say, the reason I brought it up is I personally think it's nicer not to have that really huge, tall cross. It was really, really high and probably could have been seen from lots of different locations. I think between the lowering of the height of the building and not having the cross, it's going to nestle in more effectively. I also liked the round pool of water next to the entrance now.

Mr. Sander: We're going to do a stormwater planter. It will be a good congregation area for everyone coming out, that also provides a benefit.

Chairman Dupree: When I looked at it, I thought that was a nice little addition there and it neatly solves an engineering issue. Plus it's very attractive. People love to stand around water elements.

Mr. Sander: Yeah. Water elements, plus places to sit - greenery. I personally like that feature as well.

Chairman Dupree: The other thing before we leave this topic is what kind of visual analysis we want because no one has really weighed in on that. Bonnie, do you have any suggestions or thoughts?

Ms. Franson: I think if you want to start simple, just getting a sense of what vantage points it could be visible from. Let's say residences. Then maybe doing a cross-section. If you do a cross section and showing what landscaping you're going to be putting in. That could be for a first pass and if it seems like it's reasonable, then they won't have to go into more detail as far as photo-simulations and things of that nature. If there are any particular vantage points that the Planning Board would like to be evaluated, maybe in another week-

Chairman Dupree: I think we'd be mostly looking at the residential houses that are both to the east and the south. The south isn't as worrisome because this is set down deep, but we should at least see something from that direction. Peter?

Mr. Setaro: I think some of the houses there - because we had an application some time back for a subdivision on the east side, right across and I think those houses are set back pretty far. But it's something to look at. What about anything when you're headed west down Crum Elbow, coming down to the traffic light? I think there's a lot of trees there, so you really only see it once you get to the intersection. Then you've got Victory Lake to the other side, so there's really not a lot. But maybe some cross-sections like Bonnie said to start out.

Ms. Franson: Maybe start out with an aerial showing the proposed sanctuary and what's kind of around. That will first give everyone a sense of how close buildings are to the proposed building and then from there, selecting the location to do the cross-sections. Start with an aerial within a certain distance of the sanctuary, maybe

25,000 feet out. Let's say a half mile or a quarter mile and then you can see the buildings on the aerial and then select cross-sections from the buildings that it would be visible. I don't know if the Board is going to be concerned if it's visible from a commercial building or if there are any.

Chairman Dupree: There's a residential care facility that's just north. That's somewhat tall, which is why I've always said the height here doesn't really bother me so much because you already have a tall building there as well.

Mr. Sander: I believe it's actually taller. That one's about 3 stories, whereas this is 2 built into the side.

Chairman Dupree: It's a full 3 stories and located higher up as well. I wanted to make sure we were giving you as much guidance as we could tonight, so that's what we'll start with for the visual analysis. I believe with the traffic impact study, we asked you to go back and get some ITE numbers, because you were relying on numbers given to you by the applicant and we wanted to have a comparison with what the ITE would say. That's basically it.

Mr. Sander: I've been corresponding with the traffic consultant and we have a whole draft up response to the traffic issues. I'm going to say that's not my expertise, so I'll leave it to him. But we did take some issue with the ITE numbers because of the multiple uses of the camp, it doesn't fit into any one category. He describes it better than me.

Ms. Polidoro: You can still provide them and then explain why you don't think they're appropriate.

Mr. Sander: I think that's what he tried to do, break it down into the multi-uses, but it was difficult to try to provide general numbers based on that.

Chairman Dupree: It's almost like it's an amusement park over there, in some ways. I know what he's getting at, because there are so many uses on it ultimately. Again, this is just to make sure that we have an adequate idea if there's any mitigation required that we are able to ultimately.

Mr. Pickett: If you're planning different group sizes maybe you could have those numbers.

Chairman Dupree: In other words, I'd like to conclude SEQR so we can get you going. That's why I'm bringing this up tonight.

Mr. Sander: Anything else, feel free.

Mr. Setaro: I asked before about the County Public Works Department. Our office reviewed the Traffic Impact Study before and we'll look at it again, but the ultimate deciders are going to be the DPW. I think as soon as you have the Traffic Impact Study updated, I would get in front of them as soon as possible, because they're backed up, as you probably know.

Chairman Dupree: Just to remind everyone, DCDPW took a little over 7 months to finally approve the entrance and exit for Dollar General at Dorsey, which helped cause it to expire because we had already given it all the extensions we could, plus 244 days of tolling. They weren't proceeding further because they were trying to wait on that. That's what also caused us to have to redo the resolution because of the change in the sidewalk, etc. We know it's taking a long time and I'd like to see this at least get approved before I retire from this Board. We'll get there, I promise. Any other questions or comments from anybody? Yes, Tad.

Ms. Moss: A long time ago there was a project for a China Buddhist Temple down the street and they had buses coming up from the city - I don't know where your buses are coming from or whether they are all coming at the same time, but there were improvements to the road that were going to be required for that project.

Chairman Dupree: If I recall correctly, the improvements included something with the wetland across the road, Crum Elbow.

Ms. Moss: The Sewer treatment plant was going across the road, but there were turning lanes that had to be constructed within the County Road.

Chairman Dupree: Was that project ever formally withdrawn?

Ms. Moss: Yes.

Chairman Dupree: That was a really long time ago. About 15-16 years. At any rate, Mr. Sander it's good to see you again. I love your enthusiasm for the project and the project itself. As I said, I think I said at the last meeting, I was asked to give an update to the Town Board about projects and I included this one. At first, they were like, no one is going to be interested in it and when they saw it, they were like, wait, that's pretty exciting. Because, it is. It's a large piece of land that's been designed, I think sensitively. The other issue before we conclude is that it's important for the Board to remember why we have the 100-foot buffer on either side of the center line of the stream corridor, and the way it's written in the Code, is to allow the free movement of animals. This was designed pretty sensitively so that you have kind of the ecological corridor up to the north east section left undisturbed.

Mr. Sander: Yes, so the building was initially proposed to be in the northeastern corner, but after some initial turtle studies they found that it is a potential Blandings Turtle Habitat, so we didn't want to go there. So we moved it down to the southeastern corner of the site and on the master plan we have that more as a conservation area where we do not want any future development to preserve that habitat. We actually mention this in our variances, that by providing that, we are leaving an area for the migration of endangered species or species in general.

Chairman Dupree: The corridor for movement is for all species, it can be raccoons, deer you name it, not just ETR species. I just want to point that out for the record that you did design initially drawing some things out of the area that you thought were important to conserve ecologically and environmentally. Anyway, you can go back to

your big boss and say you heard nothing but good things and we'll wait to hear back from you.

Mr. Sander: Very cool. Thank you again. It's really good to see you guys all in person.

Chairman Dupree: It's been awhile, thank you.

OTHER BUSINESS:

HYDE PARK TOWN CENTER-PARK PLAZA

Site Plan Amendment Approval Phase 2 Exterior Modification (#2020-15)

Location: 4240-4260 Albany Post Road

Grid #: 6064-02-965956

Chairman Dupree: For the next item on the agenda, we have a change in the resolution approving the Hyde Park Town Center-Park Plaza. This would be the relocation of a playground area in the rear. As discussed last time, we now have a composite fence rather than wood and we also had to make some changes based on SWPPP calculations on 18 versus 12 inches of leaf compost. Anyone have any questions? Then I believe Ms. Weiser will be introducing this tonight.

RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE CONDITIONS OF SITE PLAN APPROVAL

Hyde Park Town Center Park Plaza

Date: July 21, 2021

Moved By: Ms. Weiser

Resolution: #2020-15G

Seconded By: Vice-Chair Dexter

WHEREAS, on January 6, 2021, by Resolution #2020-15C, the Planning Board granted conditional site plan approval to Cosimo Town Center LLC to make exterior improvements and other alterations to an existing shopping center (the "Project") located at 4240-4260 Albany Post Road, Tax Parcel No. 6064-02-965956, in the Town Core PW-2 Zone (the "Property"); and

WHEREAS, said approval was subject to satisfaction of six conditions of approval; and

WHEREAS, condition 6c of Resolution #2020-15C required revision of "the Landscape Bed Bio-Planter Cross Section on Sheet LS-1 to clarify that all soil will be replaced by a minimum of eighteen inches (18") of leaf compost."; and

WHEREAS, on June 2, 2021, by Resolution #2020-15F, the Planning Board granted conditional site plan amendment approval to relocate a playground and make other associated alterations to the Property; and

WHEREAS, said approval was subject to satisfaction of four conditions of approval; and

WHEREAS, condition 4 of Resolution #2020-15F required “Revision of the Amended Site Plan Set to include screening of both refuse areas with a wood stockade fence up to 8 feet tall”; and

WHEREAS, the applicant has requested that condition 6c of Resolution #2020-15C and condition 4 of Resolution #2020-15F be amended; and

WHEREAS, the Town Zoning Administrator and Planning Board Engineer have reviewed the requests and determined that the amendments would have no impact on stormwater management.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board hereby amends condition 6c of Resolution #2020-15C to replace “eighteen inches (18”) of leaf compost” with “twelve inches (12”) of leaf compost”.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Planning Board hereby amends condition 4 of Resolution #2020-15F to replace “wood stockade fence” with “wood stockade or composite fence”.

**Aye Chairman Dupree
Aye Vice-Chair Dexter
Aye Ms. DiNapoli
Absent Mr. Oliver
Aye Mr. Pickett
Aye Ms. Wasser
Aye Ms. Weiser**

VOICE VOTE Aye-6 Absent-1 Nay-0 MOTION CARRIED

APPROVE PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

**Approve Planning Board Meeting Minutes for April 7, 2021, April 21, 2021, May 19, 2021 and June 16, 2021.
*All Board members Attended.***

**MOTION: Ms. Wasser
SECOND: Mr. Pickett**

To approve the minutes of the April 7 and 21, May 19 and June 16, 2021 Planning Board Meeting.

**Aye Ms. Weiser
Aye Ms. Wasser
Aye Mr. Pickett
Absent Mr. Oliver
Aye Ms. DiNapoli**

Aye Vice-Chair Dexter
Aye Chairman Dupree

VOICE VOTE Aye-6 Absent-1 Nay- 0 Motion Carried

Approve Planning Board Meeting Minutes for May 5, 2021.
Diane DiNapoli and Ann Weiser were absent.

MOTION: Mr. Pickett
SECOND: Ms. Wasser

To approve the minutes of the May 5, 2021 Planning Board Meeting.

| | |
|----------------|--------------------------|
| Abstain | Ms. Weiser |
| Aye | Ms. Wasser |
| Aye | Mr. Pickett |
| Absent | Mr. Oliver |
| Abstain | Ms. DiNapoli |
| Aye | Vice-Chair Dexter |
| Aye | Chairman Dupree |

VOICE VOTE Aye-4 Absent-1 Abstain-2 Nay Motion Carried

Approve Planning Board Meeting Minutes for June 2, 2021.
Brent Pickett and Stephanie Wasser were absent.

MOTION: Ms. DiNapoli
SECOND: Ms. Weiser

To approve the minutes of the June 2, 2021 Planning Board Meeting.

| | |
|----------------|--------------------------|
| Aye | Ms. Weiser |
| Abstain | Ms. Wasser |
| Abstain | Mr. Pickett |
| Absent | Mr. Oliver |
| Aye | Ms. DiNapoli |
| Aye | Vice-Chair Dexter |
| Aye | Chairman Dupree |

VOICE VOTE Aye-4 Absent-1 Abstain-2 Nay Motion Carried

There was a brief discussion about conducting interviews for potential consultants and who would like to attend and when that could be scheduled. The Board requested that Liz Axelson do a comparison between the approved Dollar General site plan and the newly received Re-application of that site plan. The Chairman thanked Mr. Setaro for following up with the DOH and the Dollar General team to discuss details of obtaining an approval from the DOH. Ms. Moss noted that she was told that water tests for the well might not be available until September or October. There was a discussion regarding the Jeffrey Groves Estate's abandonment of a section of their subdivision

(dissolution of lots and road) at the County Clerk's office and whether or not it can be reversed and how they might be able to proceed to repair this self-created issue.

ADJOURNMENT:

MOTION: Ms. DiNapoli
SECOND: Vice-Chair Dexter

To adjourn.

Aye Ms. Weiser
Aye Ms. Wasser
Aye Mr. Pickett
Absent Mr. Oliver
Aye Ms. DiNapoli
Aye Vice-Chair Dexter
Aye Chairman Dupree

VOICE VOTE Aye-6 Absent-1 Nay-0 Motion Carried

*****Motion from the September 1, 2021 Hyde Park Planning Board Meeting*****

Approve Planning Board Meeting Minutes for July 21, 2021.
Chris Oliver was absent.

MOTION: Ms. DiNapoli
SECOND: Ms. Weiser

To approve the minutes of the July 21, 2021 Planning Board Meeting.

Aye Ms. Weiser
Aye Ms. Wasser
Aye Mr. Pickett
Abstain Mr. Oliver
Aye Ms. DiNapoli
Aye Vice-Chair Dexter
Aye Chairman Dupree

VOICE VOTE Aye-6 Absent-0 Abstain-1 Nay-0 Motion Carried